

Remarks/Arguments:

In the Advisory Action of April 14, 2006, the amendment to claim 1 submitted on March 28, 2006 was objected to as lacking clarity. Namely, that it is unclear whether the beam of light or the columnar members expand to a maximum extent. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 1 states a condition that "when a beam of light entering the slab waveguide... expands to a maximum extent, the size of the beam in the slab thickness direction does not exceed the slab thickness." It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is misconstruing the subject of the verb "expands". The subject of the verb "expands" is the "beam of light." The phrase "entering the slab waveguide" modifies the subject "beam of light." The phrase "traveling periodically, said columnar members and said slab refractive index portion other than said columnar members" also modifies the subject "beam of light." Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled-in-the-art would understand that the beam of light expands from the claim language.

Applicant requests the Examiner withdraw the objection stated in the Advisory Action.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel N. Calder, Reg. 27,424
Attorney for Applicant

DNC/ds

Dated: April 28, 2006

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

April 28, 2006

Deborah Spratt

